

1 JOHN L. BURRIS, ESQ., SBN 69888
2 BEN NISENBAUM, ESQ., SBN 222173
3 JAMES COOK, ESQ., SBN 300212
4 LAW OFFICES OF JOHN L. BURRIS
5 Airport Corporate Center
6 7677 Oakport Street, Suite 1120 Oakland, CA 94621
7 Telephone: (510) 839-5200
8 Facsimile: (510) 839-3882
9 Email: John.Burris@johnburrislaw.com
10 Email: Ben.Nisenbaum@johnburrislaw.com
11 Email: James.Cook@johnburrislaw.com
12 Attorneys for Plaintiffs
13 BARBARA DOSS, et al.
14
15 Austin R. Kessler
16 Lindsey Romano (SBN 337600)
17 GORDON REES SCULLY MANSUKHANI
18 150 Fayetteville Street, Suite 1120,
19 Raleigh, NC 27601
20 Attorneys for Defendants
21 WELLPATH, INC, MICHAEL DURBIN
22 MICHAEL NARIA, MARIA SADRI, and NEENA THOMAS
23
24 Peter G. Bertling (SBN 131602)
25 Jemma Parker Saunders (SBN 227962)
26 Bertling Law Group
27 21 East Canon Perdido Street, Suite 204B
28 Santa Barbara, CA 93101
Telephone: 805-879-7558
Facsimile: 805-869-1597
peter@bertlinglawgroup.com
jemma@bertlinglawgroup.com
Attorneys for Defendant Guadalupe Garcia

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BARBARA DOSS, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

CASE NO.: 3:19-cv-07940-CRB

**JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT
CONFERENCE STATEMENT**

Judge: Hon. Charles R. Breyer
Date: March 28, 2025

COUNTY OF ALAMEDA, et al.,
Defendants.

Time: 8:30 a.m.
Crtrm: San Francisco-TBD
Trial Date: TBD

Currently, this matter is stayed pursuant to the Court's Order at Docket No. 150. Pursuant to the Court's Case Management Scheduling Order at Docket No. 151, Plaintiff and Wellpath Defendants submit the following case management statement. Wellpath Defendants prepared the statement and were unable to make contact with counsel for Guadalupe Garcia.

1. Jurisdiction and Service

Plaintiffs filed this case in federal court and assert federal question jurisdiction pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and 28 U.S.C. §§1391(b). All defendants have been served. On November 28, 2022, the Court dismissed Defendants COUNTY OF ALAMEDA, JOSHUA PLOSSER, KEVIN CALHOUN, EDUARDO RIVERA-VELAZQUEZ, MONICA DEVINE, JOSEPHINE CONSTANZO, DYLAN GREEN, and ANTHONY MOSCHETTI, with prejudice.

2. Facts

a. Plaintiffs' Contention

The incident took place on June 23, 2018. The location of the incident was Santa Rita 5325 Broder Blvd, Dublin, CA 94568. Santa Rita Jail deputies and Wellpath medical staff caused Armstrong to die as a result of excessive force and deliberate indifference to Armstrong's medical needs.

As part of sentencing in an unrelated criminal matter, Decedent was to serve time by reporting to the Jail Weekend Inmate Program at Santa Rita Jail. The incident in question took place on Decedent's second consecutive weekend reporting to Santa Rita Jail. Decedent had four months to serve in weekend increments at Santa Rita Jail. Upon reporting to Santa Rita Jail, Decedent was cleared and admitted for his weekend commitment by Alameda County Sheriff's Office's intake staff,

1 in spite of having ingested narcotics sometime before admission and exhibiting clear symptoms that
2 he was under distress.

3 On June 23, 2018, at approximately 5:25 a.m., Defendant RIVERA-VELAZQUEZ and
4 witness, Deputy Soto, observed Decedent, who had difficulty expressing coherent words to the
5 deputies. Deputy Soto told the Intake Deputies about Decedent's behavior. Deputy Valentine, who
6 began his shift at 5:00 a.m. on June 23, 2018, observed decedent yell "Help me!", with Decedent's
7 behavior worsening, as he kneeled on all fours, cried and desperately continued yelling out "Help
8 me!". Nonetheless, there is no record that suggests that any help was given to Decedent at this time.
9

10 Around 7:20 a.m., deputies advised WELLPATH Nurses GUADALUPE GARCIA that
11 ARMSTRONG needed medical help. Deputies requested GARCIA check on ARMSTRONG.
12 GARCIA knew, or should have known, that ARMSTRONG was suffering from the effects of illicit
13 drugs. At approximately 7:31 a.m., GARCIA collected a urine sample from Decedent, without
14 incident. While collecting the sample, ARMSTRONG was incoherent and slow to respond.
15 However, GARCIA failed to do a medical intake on ARMSTRONG at this time. By around 8:00
16 a.m., Armstrong told Officer Hoodye that he had ingested multiple substances, and did not feel well.
17 Over the next several hours, Armstrong alerted multiple deputies of his worsening condition, and
18 asked for medical help. However, the deputies and nurses failed to render any medical assistance to
19 Armstrong.
20

21 By approximately 2:20 p.m., deputies and nursing staff observed ARMSTRONG sticking his
22 fingers in his mouth and his anus. At that point GARCIA finally tested his urine. A preliminary drug
23 screening test revealed ARMSTRONG had consumed cocaine, methamphetamine, and marijuana.
24 Nurse GARCIA still failed to provide medical care to ARMSTRONG. At approximately 2:36 p.m.,
25 Defendant Deputy Townsend observed Decedent's behavior and noted it to be "associated with being
26
27
28

1 paranoid and scared of everyone around him.” Nurse GARCIA and Nurse MARIA SADRI then
2 attempted to complete ARMSTRONG’S triage intake screening. GARCIA and SADRI witnessed
3 ARMSTRONG exhibiting unusual behavior. ARMSTRONG was naked and slowly put his hands
4 out of the cuffing port. His actions were indicative that he was suffering from a medical emergency.
5 Nonetheless, no recorded aid of any sort was provided to Decedent during this time of crisis.
6

7 At approximately 3:00 p.m., Deputy Valentine reported that even though Decedent’s
8 condition had worsened, he was cleared for further incarceration. Around this time, nurses first
9 alerted Nurse MICHAEL DURBIN that ARMSTRONG was under the influence of illicit drugs.
10 DURBIN and nurse MICHAEL NARIA performed a visual check of ARMSTRONG. They
11 witnessed armstrong appear “zombie like”. DURBIN and NARIA failed to take ARMSTRONG’S
12 vitals or provide any medical care to him at that time. Shortly thereafter, DURBIN contacted the
13 Outpatient Housing Unit (OPHU). DURBIN spoke to FNP NEENA THOMAS. ARMSTRONG
14 needed to be transported to a hospital. However, THOMAS made the decision to transport
15 ARMSTRONG to the OPHU instead of a hospital. THOMAS failed to consult with a doctor before
16 making the decision to not transfer ARMSTRONG to the hospital. Still, DURBIN failed to even
17 transfer ARMSTRONG to the OPHU at this time. At approximately 3:31 p.m., members of the
18 nursing staff informed Defendant Deputy RIVERA-VELAZQUEZ that Decedent needed to be
19 transported to the Outpatient Housing Unit. However, there are no records that reflect that Defendant
20 Deputy RIVERA-VELAZQUEZ acted upon this medical advice and Decedent remained in his cell
21 without any care.
22
23
24

25 Defendants waited almost 24 hours, from the time Armstrong reported to Santa Rita jail to
26 attempt to provide him with the medical care he desperately needed during his time of crisis while in
27
28

1 Defendants' custody. Defendants recklessly disregarded Mr. Armstrongs behavior, which clearly
2 reflected that he needed specialized medical care.

3 At approximately 6:30 p.m., Defendants finally began to transport Decedent to the Outpatient
4 Housing Unit. Decedent was initially transported by Defendants PLOSSER, RIVERA-VELAZQUEZ
5 and CALHOUN. Shortly after the transportation began, Decedent increasingly became more agitated
6 and distressed as Defendants COSTANZO, DEVINE and GREEN joined the transportation. During
7 transportation, Decedent continued to exhibit symptoms of paranoia and severe distress, resulting in
8 him being reluctant to be taken out of his cell and walked to the Outpatient Housing Unit. At some
9 point during transportation, Defendant Deputies slammed Armstrong down to the ground and began
10 violently striking Decedent with their knees and feet.

13 Despite showing obvious signs of distress and paranoia, Decedent, while handcuffed behind
14 his back and sitting in a L position, was asphyxiated by restraint, as the officers forced Decedent's
15 upper body towards his feet, with Defendant deputies applying force on Decedent's head, neck,
16 shoulder and back. Defendants then placed Decedent in a WRAP device. In addition, though he was
17 not spitting, a spit mask was placed over Decedent's head.

19 Shortly thereafter, a nurse attempted to check Decedent's pulse and was unable to locate one.
20 Despite resuscitation efforts, Decedent was pronounced deceased at 7:24 p.m. As stated in the
21 Coroner's Report, Decedent died as a result of being asphyxiated by Defendants during restraint.
22 Plaintiffs contend that that Decedent was dead or dying when the spit mask was put on his face, and
23 that Defendants placed the spit mask to conceal Decedent's actual medical condition, that Decedent
24 was dead or dying.

26 To add further insult to injury, Alameda County Officials within the District Attorney's
27 Office placed a "media hold" on the coroner's report, which prevented Plaintiffs from accessing the
28

1 information for over a year. This report contains critical information that would have provided
2 Decedent's family with answers regarding the circumstances surrounding their loved one's death.
3 Instead, Plaintiffs were simply left to speculate for over one year regarding Decedent's death.
4

5 As a result of the Defendants misconduct, the Plaintiffs suffered the loss of their loved one.
6 Mr. Armstrong leaves behind his mother, and two children. As such, Mr. Armstrong's children are
7 entitled to recover damages incurred by Decedent before he died as a result of being denied his right
8 to life and enjoyment of life, and to any penalties or punitive damages to which Decedent would have
9 been entitled to recover had he lived, including damages incurred by Decedent, consisting of pain and
10 suffering he endured during the time he struggled for his life, as a result of the violation of his civil
11 rights.
12

13 b. Defendants' Contention

14 Defendants:

15 Wellpath, Inc. does not provide clinical care to patients at the jail. Rather, California Forensic
16 Medical Group (CFMG) employs medical professional to provide medical care to the prisoner
17 population in Santa Rita Jail. The Defendants, MICHAEL DURBIN, MICHAEL NARIA, MARIA
18 SADRI, and NEENA THOMAS all were employed by CFMG and dedicated their time at CFMG to
19 delivering medical care to the inmates, like Dajuan Armstrong within the jail
20
21

22 This is a wrongful death action regarding an in custody incident (and then later death) of
23 Dajuan Armstrong ("Armstrong"), a twenty-three year old male, at the Outpatient Housing Unit
24 ("OPHU") of the Santa Rita Jail (SRJ) on June 23, 2018. During transport to OPHU, Alameda
25 County Sheriff Office ("ACSO") deputies used force to control Armstrong, including the deployment
26 of the WRAP leg restraint and spit mask. Subsequent to the use of force, Armstrong died. The
27 County Coroner determined that Armstrong tested positive for narcotics, and died of asphyxiation.
28

1 Priot to his incarceration at SRJ, decedent was convicted of burglary and sentenced to serve
2 120 days in jail. He was authorized to complete his jail time on weekends. On June 22, 2018 at 8:37
3 p.m., Decedent arrived at the jail. Because he answered "no" to all relevant medical questions, he
4 was not given a medical assessment. Aat 10:15 p.m., he was transferred to a "sobering" cell because
5 of his behavior.
6

7 On Saturday, June 23rd, at 6:00 a.m., Decedent admitted to an ACSO deputy that he was under
8 the influence of narcotics—something the deputies had suspected based on Decedent's behavior. On
9 June 23 at 7:30 a.m., staff completed a medical evaluation of Decedent. Staff took a urine sample
10 from Decedent and tested it at 2:00 p.m. The sample tested positive for cocaine, methamphetamine
11 and marijuana. Staff completed a medical assessment of Decedent at 2:36 p.m. Nurse Garcia
12 determined that Decedent's vital signs were normal, cleatred him to join the jail's population and
13 initiated drug withdrawal protocol. Later in the afternoon, staff moved Decedent to the medical unit
14 OPHU for further and closer observation because of his drug screen and bizarre behavior.
15

16 During Armstrong's transport to the OPHU, he physically resisted deputies while he was
17 handcuffed. He attempted to walk in the opposite direction, pushed, and attempted to trip the ACSO
18 deputies before trying to run. In order to control Decedent and protect themselves, ACSO deputies
19 used force. They took Decedent to the ground and admistered several fist and knee strikes to get him
20 under control. Deputies also placed Armstrong into a WRAP—a lower body restraint device.
21 Deputies tightened the WRAP's straps and put a spit mask on Decedent. Then, Deputies put
22 Decedent on a gurney.
23

24 While being wheeled to the OPHU on a gurney, Decedent's pulse stopped and breathing both
25 stopped. CPR/medical was then immediately administered. Decedent was then taken to a hopsital
26 where he died at 7:23 p.m.—about 24 hours after he first arrived at SRJ.
27
28

1 On June 25th, Dr. Magat, the Medical Director of CFMG, opined that cardiopulmonary arrest
2 was the preliminary cause of death. She noted that Armstrong was 5'11" and weighed 271 pounds. At
3 intake, he appeared angry and uncooperative. His drug screen confirmed the presence of marijuana,
4 cocaine, and methamphetamine. Dr. Magat noted that Decedent became increasingly agitated while
5 being transported to OPHU resulting in ACSO deputies using force to restrain him.

6 Dr. M. Ferenc, a forensic pathologist, completed Decedent's autopsy. The coroner determined
7 Decedent's cause of death was mechanical asphyxia with cardiac hypertrophy and obesity being listed
8 as other conditions. The coroner further determined that while the toxicological analysis confirmed
9 drugs in Decedent's system, these drugs did not contribute to his cause of death. Notably, the coroner
10 found that Decedent had preexisting pulmonary congestion, cardiac hypertrophy and dilation, and
11 borderline severe obesity. Combined with his severe obesity, preexisting heart issues, agitation, and
12 physical exertion, Decedent's toxicology results suggest that excited delirium possibly
13 contributed/caused his death. The cause and manner of Decedent's death will be considerable issue in
14 this case. Wellpath Defendants deny the Plaintiffs' contentions regarding this issue. They assert that
15 the care provided to Decedent was appropriate and deny all allegations of deliberate indifference.
16

17 Medical defendants assert that the care provided to the inmate patient Mr. Armstrong was
18 appropriate for the condition as presented by the patient and that there was no deliberate indifference
19 to any serious medical need of the patient as alleged or at all. Medical defendants further contend
20 that all care provided to Mr. Armstrong met appropriate standards of care, and nothing they did or did
21 not do caused or contributed to decedent's death and plaintiffs' damages. Defendants contend at all
22 times appropriate policies and procedures were in place and there is no basis for a *Monell* claim as to
23 these defendants.

24 3. Legal Issues

25 The FAC currently asserts the following federal claims against the remaining Defendants: 1)
26 Section 1983 violation of the Eighth Amendment – Decedents Right to be Free from Cruel and
27 Unusual Punishment; 2) Section 1983 violation of Fourteenth Amendment – Plaintiffs' civil right to a
28

1 familial relationship; In addition, the FAC asserts the following state law claims: 1) violation of
2 California Civil Code § 845.6; 2) negligence.

3 These claims raise at least the following issues:

4 • Whether Defendants violated Decedent's and Plaintiffs' constitutional and statutory rights
5 through their policies, practices, and customs (42 U.S.C. § 1983, *Monell v. Dep't of Soc. Servs.*, 436
6 U.S. 658 (1978).)

7 • Whether there was an underlying constitutional violation to support a *Monell* theory of
8 liability.

9 • Whether defendants by their acts, omissions, customs, and policies, acting in
10 concert/conspiracy, violated Plaintiffs' rights to be free from deliberate indifference to his serious but
11 treatable medical needs and/or access thereto; to be free from wrongful government interference with
12 familial relationships. (Cal. Civ. Code §§ 52 and 52.1.)

13 • Whether Defendants had a duty of care to Plaintiffs and whether they breached that duty to
14 provide sufficient, competent, prompt medical care and/or access thereto to decedent.

15 • Whether Defendant's medical providers had a duty of care to Plaintiffs to provide decedent
16 competent and reasonable medical care and treatment and/or access thereto, whether they breached
17 that duty; whether Defendant WELLPATH are vicariously liable for their employees or agents.

18 • Whether any Defendant caused, contributed or was a substantial moving factor in causing
19 any of Plaintiffs' alleged damages or Decedent's death.

20 • Whether any defendant, acting under color of state law, deprived Plaintiffs of their right to a
21 familial relationship in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment.

22 • Whether and to what extent, each separate Defendant is liable for general damages, treble
23 damages and/or for punitive damages.

- Whether any individual defendant is entitled to qualified immunity.
- Whether Plaintiffs’ state law claims are barred by various California Government Code immunities.
- The extent of Plaintiffs, decedent, and/or third parties’ responsibility for decedent and Plaintiffs’ injuries and damages, and the extent to which Plaintiffs, decedent, and/or third parties’ responsibility reduces any damages for which Defendants may be liable..

4. Motions

Plaintiffs anticipate filing motions *in limine*. Wellpath Defendants anticipate filing motions *in limine* and a motion for summary judgment/summary adjudication. Defendant Garcia remains represented by Bertling Law Group and will file a motion for summary judgment/summary adjudication, and motions *in limine*.

5. Amendment of Pleadings

Plaintiffs do not anticipate a need to amend the pleadings at this time. Wellpath Defendants anticipate that Plaintiffs will need to amend the First Amended complaint because they included an improper corporate entity—WELLPATH INC.

6. Evidence Preservation

Both Plaintiffs and Defendants are aware of their duty to preserve evidence and have taken steps to preserve all potentially relevant evidence.

7. Disclosures

The parties have made their initial disclosures.

1 **8. Discovery**

2 The Parties have participated in written discovery. The parties have not yet completed
3 depositions. The parties do not anticipate the need for additional discovery beyond what is permitted
4 by standard procedure but will approach the court if it becomes necessary to adjust these limits.
5

6 **9. Class Actions**

7 This is not a class-action matter.

8 **10. Related cases**

9 The parties are unaware of any related cases.
10

11 **11. Relief**

12 Plaintiffs are seeking general, special, and punitive damages in an unspecified amount.
13 Defendants are seeking a dismissal of the case and the potential for recovery of costs and fees.
14

15 **12. Settlement and ADR**

16 The parties attended a settlement conference on May 28, 2024 at 10:00 a.m. before Honorable
17 Judge Laurel Beeler. The conference was brief and did not resolve the claims. Plaintiffs are open to
18 additional settlement discussions. Defendants request another settlement conference or other ADR
19 proceeding prior to trial.
20

21 **13. Consent to Judge for All Purposes**

22 Plaintiffs consented to a Magistrate Judge. Wellpath Defendants prefer Your Honor handle
23 this case in all respects.
24

25 **14. Other reference**

26 The parties do not believe the case is suitable for reference to binding arbitration, a special
27 master, or the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation.
28

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28

None at this time.

16. Expedited Schedule

The parties do not request an expedited schedule at this time.

17. Scheduling:

Currently, this matter is stayed pursuant to the Court's Order at Docket No. 150.

18. Trial:

The parties have demanded a jury trial, expected to last approximately 10-14 days.

19. Disclosure of Non-Party Interested Entities or Persons:

Plaintiffs: None.

Defendants: None.

20. Other matters

None at this time.

Dated: March 21, 2025

THE LAW OFFICES OF JOHN L. BURRIS

/s/ James Cook

Ben Nisenbaum, Esq.

James Cook, Esq.

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

Dated: March 21, 2025

GORDON REES SCULLY MANSUKHANI, LLP

/s/ Lindsey Romano

Lindsey Romano

Austin R. Kessler

Attorneys for Wellpath Defendants